## **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of this application is requested. Claims 1-18 and 24-39 are in the case.

### I. THE 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH, REJECTION

It is noted, with appreciation, that this rejection has been withdrawn.

## II. THE 35 U.S.C. § 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH, REJECTION

It is noted, with appreciation, that this rejection has been withdrawn.

# III. THE 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH, REJECTION

It is noted, with appreciation, that this rejection has been withdrawn.

#### IV. DOUBLE PATENTING

It is noted, with appreciation, that this rejection has been withdrawn.

## V. THE OBVIOUSNESS REJECTION

Claims 1-15, 17, 18, 24, 25, 35-37 and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,959,373 to Lubisch et al. That rejection is respectfully traversed.

On page 3 of the Action, the Examiner has essentially required Applicants to disclaim all compounds wherein B-CR<sup>5</sup>R<sup>6</sup>-A forms a C<sub>2</sub>-C<sub>4</sub> alkylene group. While Applicants do not wish to limit the claims to such an extent, proviso (a) has been

ALSTERMARK et al Serial No. **09/623,726** 

February 20, 2004

amended to specify that when R7 is alkyl optionally substituted with a group selected

from C<sub>1</sub>-C<sub>4</sub> alkyl, halogen or C<sub>1</sub>-C<sub>4</sub> alkoxy, then B-CR<sup>5</sup>R<sup>6</sup>-A does not represent a C<sub>2</sub>-C<sub>4</sub>

alkylene group. The reasoning for this proposed proviso language is as follows.

Lubisch does not disclose phenyl which can be substituted by anything at any

position, but rather discloses optionally PARA-substituted phenyl where the optional

substituent is chosen from  $C_1$ - $C_4$  alkyl, halogen or  $C_1$ - $C_4$  alkoxy (see page 1, lines 59-60

of Lubisch). Based on this disclosure, Applicants have disclaimed those compounds

and wherein B-CR<sup>5</sup>R<sup>6</sup>-A forms a C<sub>2</sub>-C<sub>4</sub> alkylene group.

In light of the above, a person of ordinary skill would not have been motivated to

arrive at compounds falling within the scope of the presently claimed invention based on

the Lubisch disclosure. Absent any such motivation, it is clear that a prima facie case of

obviousness is not generated by Lubisch. Withdrawal of the outstanding obviousness

rejection based on that reference is accordingly respectfully requested.

Allowance of the application is awaited.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.** 

By:

LCM:Ifm

1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor

Arlington, VA 22201-4714

Telephone: (703) 816-4000

Facsimile: (703) 816-4100

- 28 -

816740